## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ISAAC MURRAY,	]	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO.05-1544</b>
Plaintiff,	]	
	]	
	,	<u>ORDER</u>
-VS-	1	
PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH,	]	
DEPT. USA;		
SECRETARY GENERAL	]	
FNU KOFIANA, UN DEPT;		
ALL NATIONS' DEPTS;	]	
ALL COUNTRIES' DEPTS;		
ALL STATES' DEPTS;	]	
ALL CITIES' DEPTS;		
ALL COUNTIES DEPTS;	]	
ALL PROVINCES' DEPTS;	_	
ALL TERRITORIES AND DOES	}	
IN THE WORLD;	_	
FNU HOLLING, ALL SC;	J	
FNU THURMOND ALL DECEASED	-	
OR HEIRS	J	
FOOD AND DRUGS, ALL USA'	•	
SURGEON GENERAL ALL, AND	l	
ALL DOES,	1	
D. C. J.	1	
Defendants.		

In the underlying matter, the plaintiff, Isaac Murray, is a patient at Bryan Psychiatric Hospital in Columbia. The plaintiff is proceeding  $pro\ se$  and has filed an action against numerous defendants. Plaintiff seeks damages of \$999 Zillion + 99 cents.

Pursuant to the Local Rules of this Court, this matter was referred to United States



Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for review. In his report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court dismiss this action due to the plaintiff's failure to state a cause of action upon which this court can grant relief. The plaintiff has not objected to the recommendation.

The applicable standard of review for this Court is clear. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Matthews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the report and recommendation to which specific objection is made 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C). However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge as to those portions of the recommendation to which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In the instant action, the plaintiff has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

The Court is aware that the plaintiff is *pro se* and has carefully reviewed the plaintiff's complaint. Upon review, the court notes that the plaintiff has named numerous defendants. However, plaintiff's complaint fails to state any specific allegations against any of the individual defendants. Instead, the plaintiff generally alleges that the defendants have not followed his directions. Accordingly, the Court finds no basis upon which this court can exercise jurisdiction over the allegations set forth in plaintiff's complaint. The Court concurs with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this case should be dismissed. The Magistrate Judge's recommendation is approved. For the reasons set forth in the Report and



3:05-cv-01544-MJP Date Filed 08/04/05 Entry Number 9 Page 3 of 3

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this action is hereby DISMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

MATTHEW J. PERRY JR.

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina